

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Application No. : 10/522,921 Confirmation No. : 6640  
First Named Inventor : Detlef RENNER  
Filed : September 20, 2005  
TC/A.U. : 3726  
Examiner : Alexander P. Taousakis  
  
Docket No. : 011235.55725US  
Customer No. : 23911  
  
Title : Method and System for Maintenance, in Particular  
Disassembly, of Gas Turbines

**RESPONSE TO  
ELECTION/RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

**Mail Stop AMENDMENT**  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Election/Restriction Requirement mailed January 15, 2009, the Applicant elects Group 1, claims 1-9, with traverse. The two-month response due date, extended to the first business day following a weekend and a Federal holiday, is February 17, 2009.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the pending Election/Restriction Requirement. The Examiner maintains that the claimed method and claimed system lack "special technical features" of the other, specifically, Group I is said to lack an apparatus for disassembly of a gas turbine, and Group II is said to lack "removing a gas turbine from a cleaning apparatus." January 15, 2009 Election/Restriction Requirement at 2.

Method claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, cleaning a turbine in a special apparatus (“a first apparatus which is at least largely sealed against a cleaning agent being emitted therein”) before disassembling the turbine for maintenance.

System claim 10 recites, *inter alia*, the *same* special turbine cleaning apparatus before an apparatus for disassembling the turbine for maintenance.

As a first matter, the concept of “removing a gas turbine from a cleaning apparatus” is not a “special technical feature,” and moreover, this “feature” is not lacking from system claim 10 – indeed, removing the turbine is inherent in the subject matter of claim 10, as the turbine necessarily must be moved from the cleaning apparatus to the disassembly apparatus to permit disassembly of the gas turbine.

Nor is method claim 1 lacking any *significant* technical feature of claim 10. Claim 1 recites a method of cleaning a turbine before it is sent for disassembly; claim 10 recites an apparatus for the *same* cleaning method before disassembly (*i.e.*, in the recited turbine disassembly apparatus).

Thus, in terms of the alleged search burden, the Applicant respectfully submits that there is no *significant* technical difference between claims 1 and 10 that would cause *any* serious search burden or significant increase in the examination burden. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Election/Restriction Requirement be withdrawn and that all claims 1-15 be examined at this time.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket #011235.55725US).

February 17, 2009

Respectfully submitted,



Robert L. Graberek, Jr.  
Registration No. 40,625  
Mark H. Neblett .  
Registration No. 42,028

CROWELL & MORING LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
RLG:MHN:gtm  
7263576